Torrance, California January 3, 1950

MINUTES OF A PROTEST HEARING BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE

The City Council of the City of Torrance convened in the Council Chamber of the City Hall, on Tuesday, January 3, 1950 at 8:20 p.m., for the purpose of holding a protest hearing, Mayor Sherfey presiding.

Clerk Bartlett called the roll, those responding being: COUNCIL-MEN: Drale, Haggard, Jackson, Powell and Sherfey. Also present were City Manager Stevens and City Attorney Smith.

Mayor Sherfey announced the hearing had been called for the purpose of discussing the fees set up under Ordinance No. 483.

Clerk Bartlett advised the Council that he had received 34 written protests against the fees established and furnished each member of the Council with a list of such protests. He then proceeded to read additional protests from:

California Rendering Co. ... waste suet, fat, etc.

2. John Morrell & Co. meat packer

3. Sanitary Supply Ass'n Sanitek Products 4. Venus Foods grocery items 5. Gardner Food Products grocery items

Harry E. Setzer soft drink vending machines

Oral Protests were then called for and the following were heard:

1. Don Wolf, 21804 So. Halldale contractor

2. Tom Watson, 1446 W. 219th contractor (plaster) 3. W. H. Newman, 23320 So. Harvard ... contractor (elect.)
4. A. W. Strang, 1639 W. 220th contractor (paint)
5. Kenneth Olson, 1635 W. Carson contractor
6. Jack Schumes, 2223 Torrance Blvd. ...market

7. Harry Jaggard, 2039 Reynosa Dr. vending machine

9. Mr. Hines, Blake, Moffitt & Towne .. paper (Long Beach)

10. J. E. Thomas, Torrance Food Center . meat

11. Mr. Sharis, Coca Cola Bottling Co.

Contractors protesting were not in favor of difference in fee for resident and non-resident. Markets objected to the wholesale and retail fee being the same, stating that some of their suppliers had already advised they would by-pass Torrance. The vending machine owner objected to paying \$24 per machine, advising other cities charged from \$2 per machine to \$25 per year regardless of the number of machines.

In answer to Mr. Sharis, of the Coca Cola Bottling Company, City Attorney Smith advised that the sale of coca cola by the bottle was incidental to the grocer's business, and the fact that he kept it in a vending machine was still incidental to the business and he would not have to pay a double license fee.

Discussion of what constituted a vending machine, and what constitutes goods, wares and merchandise followed.

Mr. Newman suggested that possibly the City could set up a schedule of fees whereby the first year a man was in business he would pay a substantial sum, and when the license is renewed the second year his fee would be only a nominal amount.

Mr. Hines, of Blake, Moffitt & Towne, cautioned the Council about taxing too much and suggested possibly government operating expenses could be curtailed rather than increasing the license tax.

Mr. Joe Van Kralingen, of 216th St., asked about distribution of handbills and City Attorney Smith advised that portion of the ordinance had nothing to do with unionism, or religion, or a merchant advertising his own goods, wares and merchandise.

Question was raised as to the delinquent date indicated on the "due" notices issued by the Clerk's office and City Attorney Smith advised that a person not doing business in the City need not take out a license until such time as he did business, and at that time he would pay his proportionate share. Clerk Bartlett urged that anyone not doing business in the City, and not wishing to renew his license now, notify the Clerk's office so that argument would not come up later as to whether or not the person was delinquent.

Following the discussion, Mayor Sherfey advised the audience that the matter would be given every consideration. Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.